## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Sanchez Ozell McPherson,	) C/A No. 0:15-1859-RMG-PJG
Plaintiff,	)
v.	ORDER
SPO M. Kutz, Officer, Charleston Police	)
Department; Detective Osburne, Charleston	)
Police Department,	)
Defendants.	
	_ )

The plaintiff has filed this action, *pro se*, alleging a violation of his constitutional rights. Plaintiff is a federal inmate currently housed at the Federal Correction Complex in Allenwood, Pennsylvania. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss on November 5, 2015, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 37.) As the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the court entered an order pursuant to <u>Roseboro v. Garrison</u>, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) on November 6, 2015, advising the plaintiff of the importance of a motion to dismiss and of the need for him to file an adequate response. (ECF No. 38.) The plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, the defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending his case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's <u>Roseboro</u> order, the plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action.

Based on the foregoing, it is

**ORDERED** that the plaintiff shall advise the court as to whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to the defendants' motion to dismiss within fourteen (14) days from

the date of this order. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, **this action will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute.** See Davis v. Williams, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Paige J. Gossett

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

December 15, 2015 Columbia, South Carolina